

Appl. No. 09/856,552  
Amtd. Dated June 15, 2005  
Reply to Office action of March 15, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P09516-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3138

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has canceled claims 1-9. New claims 11-21 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 11-21 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Examiner Objections – Information Disclosure Statement**

The Office Action indicted that the information disclosure statement filed on April 24, 2002, fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). The Applicant respectfully submits that the information disclosure statement filed on April 24, 2002 does comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) in that the statement lists (1) all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office; (2) there is a separate section for U.S. patents and U.S. patent applications; (3) the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted is on each page; (4) a blank space next to each document to be considered for the examiner's initials is provided; and (5) there is a heading that clearly indicates the list is an information disclosure statement. The information disclosure statement was submitted with an information disclosure statement transmittal letter, an information disclosure statement, and an information disclosure statement by Applicant (substitute for form PTO-1449). The Applicant is submitting copies of these items which has been stamped as being received by the USPTO on April 25, 2002, Technology Center 2100.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. Claims 1-9 have been cancelled

Appl. No. 09/856,552  
Amtd. Dated June 15, 2005  
Reply to Office action of March 15, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P09516-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3138

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1-3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tams et al. (US 6,279,037 hereinafter Tams) in view of Van Doren, et al. (US 6,061,765 hereinafter Van Doren). In order to expedite allowance of this application, the Applicant has canceled the claims 1-9 without prejudice.

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tams and Van Doren and further in view of "Official Notice". In order to expedite allowance of this application, the Applicant has canceled the claims 4-5 without prejudice.

Claims 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tams in view of "Official Notice". In order to expedite allowance of this application, the Applicant has canceled the claims 7 and 9 without prejudice.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tams and further in view of Van Doren. In order to expedite allowance of this application, the Applicant has canceled the claim 8 without prejudice.

The Applicant discloses an arrangement and method for reducing the amount of messages being transmitted in a telecom network. "Worker" processors in base stations receive data associated with mobile end stations for processing. The worker processor is coupled to an "Administrative" processor that maintains the particular types of data (probes) that are found on each worker processor. When a command is issued for probe values, the administrative processor contacts only the worker processors that have the particular probes for which the command is issued. This reduces the communication between all the worker processors that maintain that particular probe.

Appl. No. 09/856,552  
Amtd. Dated June 15, 2005  
Reply to Office action of March 15, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P09516-US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3138

**Prior Art Not Relied Upon**

In paragraph 21 on page 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: June 15, 2005

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024  
  
(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com